DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 032 CG 004 764

AUTHOR Baker, Norma J.
TITLE Evidence for Increasing Levels of Cynicism and Anxiety in College Freshman Classes.
INSTITUTION George Peabody Coll. for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.
PUB DATE May 69
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Washington, D.C., August 31--September 4, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
DESCRIPTORS *Anxiety, *Attitudes, *College Freshmen, Competitive Selection, Critical Thinking, Cultural Differences, *Student Alienation, Student Attitudes, Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

To determine whether there has been a deterioration of idealism and a growth of anxiety and cynicism in college students, seven of the ten freshman classes entering the same college between 1959 and 1968 were administered either the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (PHN), the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (TMA), or both during the first week on campus. Separate analysis of males and females in five classes between 1962-1968 indicated significant increases in more recent classes in regard to cynicism and distrust of human nature. Another major finding was an increase in overt anxiety. Explanations for these changes include: (1) greater exposure to impoverished environments, (2) increasing competition for grades to get into college, (3) schools possible emphasis on critical thinking, (4) television, and (5) accelerated rate of innovation. (KJ/Author)

Evidence for Increasing Levels of Cynicism and Anxiety in College Freshman Classes[1]

Norma J. Baker

George Peabody College for Teachers

Abstract

To determine if there has been a deterioration of idealism and a growth of anxiety and cynicism in college students, seven of the ten freshman classes entering the same college between 1959 and 1968 were administered either the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, or both during the first week on campus. Separate analyses of males and females in five classes between 1962-1968 indicated significant increases in more recent classes in regard to cynicism and distrust of human nature. Similarly, comparisons of six classes between 1959-1968 indicated a significant linear increase in anxiety from earlier to more recent classes.

[1] This paper was written to fulfill research requirements for Psychology 398, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, May, 1969. Portions of the data presented here were presented at the American Psychological Association convention, Washington, D.C., September, 1969. (Wrightsman, L. S., and Baker, N.J. Where have all the idealistic, imperturbable freshmen gone? Proceedings, 77th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association, 1969, pp. 299-300.)

College students as a segment of American society are highly visible in 1969. Professional journals, as well as popular news media, have recently devoted increased attention to an analysis of college students' behavior.

The purpose of this paper is to report an investigation of changes in certain basic attitudes and anxieties of entering college freshmen between 1959 and 1968.

Past data on the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman, 1967) indicated that there might be a trend toward lower scores on the dimensions measuring positive views of human nature. The present study began with the testing of freshmen entering George Peabody College in 1968 and built upon data collected previously as an attempt to see if empirical evidence supported the assumption that college students are becoming more cynical and more anxious.

American college students have traditionally carried forward the traits of optimism, of idealism, and of faith in a future full of opportunity.

Sanford (1962), in describing the developmental status of the entering freshman, included the following description of the freshman entering Vassar College: ". . .the typical entering freshman is idealistic, sociable, well-organized, and well-behaved."

Most descriptions of college students in the 1950's referred to them as docile and serious about their own work but apathetic about larger social concerns.

Jacob's description of college students as being "gloriously contented" in 1957 seems far removed from the current image of American campus life. His comprehensive survey of studies dealing with student values included the following conclusions:

"The traditional moral virtues are valued by almost all students . . . American students are . . . dutifully responsive towards government . . . Inter-

national problems are the least of the concerns to which they expect to give much personal attention during their immediate future . . . Students by and large set great stock by college in general and their own college in particular." (Jacob, 1957, pp. 2-3)

The label "privatism" was used by Jacob (1957) to describe a value pattern which includes a pronounced unconcern for social problems and the wider world and a feeling of estrangement and distance from what older generations represent. From his survey of college students' values Jacob estimated that 75% or 80% of the college population had a privatistic value system.

Other surveys in the 1950's concurred with the evaluation of college students as being apathetic and politically disinterested. Goldsen (1960) saw their apathy as a withdrawal from the increasing complexities of their generation.

Discussing social change and American youth Keniston (1962) emphasized the decline in political involvement among college youth as a corollary of the emphasis on the private and the present. Underlying their preference for an aesthetic rather than a political commitment was a feeling of public powerlessness. Keniston used the term alienated to describe students whose feeling of powerlessness extended beyond matters of political and social interest. Alienation included the feeling that one's influence could not be felt in any area beyond his own personal sphere.

In what appeared to be an attempt to see beyond students' withdrawal or feeling of alienation Mogar (1964) reported results which contradicted Jacob's earlier conclusion that students were "gloriously contented" with regard to their outlook for the future. Mogar found that a significant minority of students were struggling with their current "valuelessness." He suggested that

their withdrawal could be interpreted as a rebellion against convention and popular values.

Indeed, rebellion came to the surface in the school year 1964-1965. That was not the year for goldfish swallowing, panty raids, or stacking students in telephone booths. The Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, student demonstrations, and teach-ins made it appear that American students had taken a fresh look at the world, and that they did not like what they saw.

Since 1965 the university has appeared to be a major vehicle of dissent. Protest (Cowan, 1966), ferment (Mallery, 1966), anomie (Goodman, 1966), unrest (Crane, 1967), mistrust (Shaffer, 1967), activism (Sampson, 1967), stress (Brown, 1967), radicalism (Flacks, 1967), and cynicism (Greeley, 1968) are currently the terms being used to describe American college students.

The 1960's appear to have been a decade of rapid social change, accompanied by crucial changes in the behavior of college students. Although much has been written about student unrest there have been relatively few empirical studies of underlying attitudes.

One recent attempt to find personality correlates of moral reasoning and political-social behavior (Haan, Smith, Block, 1968) included Free Speech Movement arrestees, activists, "non-students," Peace Corps volunteers, and randomly-selected students from the University of California and San Francisco State College. Using Kohlberg's method for measuring moral judgment the researchers analyzed differences among five moral types with regard to family-social backgrounds and self-and ideal descriptions. In general, they found that students of principled moral reasoning, as contrasted with the conventionally moral, were more active in political-social matters, particularly in protest. The self-and ideal descriptions of the principled moralists emphasized interpersonal reactivity

and obligation, self-expressiveness, and a willingness to live in opposition.

Using Durkheim's concept of anomie Goodman (1966) saw some positive aspects in contemporary student behavior. She suggested that some college students are moving from limitless self-indulgence as a source of kicks into remarkably Spartan and unqualified commitment. It is perhaps a move away from inertia, through hedonism, toward social activity.

Attention has been directed to the campus by the activists; yet the results of several studies lead to the conclusion that student activism involves only a few select students in a very few select colleges and universities. Peterson (1967) found that only about 9% of any student body were reported as involved in protest movements, and that the protest occurred disproportionately often at select institutions of high quality. Keniston (1967) made a distinction between the activists and the alienated and said that dissent is by no means the dominant mood of American college students. Summarizing a number of surveys he concluded that apathy and privatism were still far more dominant than dissent.

Feuer (1969) reviewed the American student movement, as symbolized by the Berkeley uprising, and concluded that activism was peripheral to the philosophies and lives of the vast number of American students. Although the majority of students are not activists they are affected by what Feuer calls "the secondary consequences of student activism which brought dangers to the United States." Among those dangers he lists the activists' example of violence and contempt for democratic procedure and their intimidation of the majority.

In view of the lack of empirical studies of underlying attitudes as compared to the vast amount of speculation concerning student behavior the present investigation was designed to see if there is evidence for the assumption that college students are becoming more cynical. It was an attempt to find whether or not the traditional idealism of the American college student is "turning sour," as

some have suggested (Shaffer, 1967). The questions with which this study deals are these: Are there actually measurable changes in the beliefs of college students about the basic nature of man? Is the current social change accompanied by increases in anxiety in American youth? A survey was made of seven entering freshman classes at the same college between 1959 and 1968 to see if more recent freshman classes possessed more cynical attitudes.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were the 1811 freshmen at George Peabody College in seven entering classes from 1959 to 1968. (The classes of 1961, 1963, and 1964 were not tested.) Peabody is primarily a teacher-training institution, with about three-fourths of its freshmen aspiring to enter teaching or school-related professions. The sex ratio for freshman classes is consistently about three females for every male.

Instruments

The principal instruments used in the present investigation were the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (Wrightsman, 1964) and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1953). The former, abbreviated PHN, is an 84-item Likert-type scale measuring one's beliefs about six characteristics of human nature. Four of these dimensions are substantive ones; the other two deal with beliefs about individual differences. There is evidence for adequate reliability and validity of the scale (Wrightsman, 1964, 1968; Nottingham, Gorsuch, and Wrightsman, 1968). The Taylor MAS is a widely used measure of trait anxiety.

Additional information was obtained from the College Student Questionnaire (ETS, 1965) and the ACT measures of scholastic aptitude (ACT, 1965).

Procedure

Each freshman class was tested at the completion of its freshman orientation week. The same battery of tests was administered under the same conditions in the same order each year to each group. Instructions were the same for each class taking the entire battery.

Table 1 indicates the tests given to each freshman class. Although the PHN was not administered at Peabody prior to 1962, scores on the Taylor MAS were available from the freshman classes of 1959 and 1960 (in addition to more recent classes) and are therefore included in this report.

ACT percentile scores for each entering class (1963, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968) were obtained from the College Records Office.

Data Analysis

Comparisons were made among classes, using a one-way analysis of variance on the Taylor MAS scores and on each of the PHN subscales. Chi square comparisons were made of the frequency of responses of the various classes on ten items selected from the College Student Questionnaire, Part 1.

Since previous research had indicated sex differences on most PHN subscales (Wrightsman, 1964) the analysis of data was made separately for males and females.

Results

The mean scores on the four substantive subscales of the PHN showed a unidirectional trend toward a more negative view of human nature from 1962 through 1968. Those dimensions are: (1) Trustworthiness--the extent to which people are seen as moral, honest, and reliable; (2) Strength of Will and Rationality--the extent to which it is believed that people understand the motives behind their behavior and the extent to which it is believed that they have control over their own outcomes; (3) Altruism--the extent of beliefs about the unselfishness,

sincere sympathy, and concern for others present in people; (4) Independence--the extent of beliefs about human ability to maintain one's convictions in the face of society's pressures toward conformity.

In both male and female samples, the 1962 freshmen had the most favorable beliefs about human nature on each of the four substantive dimensions. Scores on each subscale can range from -42 to +42. The mean score for females on Trustworthiness dropped from +9.80 in 1962 to -0.41 in 1968. An even greater decline was found in the Trustworthiness subscale for males. The mean went from +8.38 in 1962 to -5.38 in 1968. The mean score on Altruism for females dropped from +5.10 in 1962 to -3.91 in 1968. For males, the Altruism mean was +1.54 in 1962 and was -11.58 in 1968. Each of the four more recent classes was less favorable or more negative than the classes before on these positive-negative dimensions, with the exception of a slight regression in the 1967 freshman class. Analyses of variance indicated that both the male and female groups differed significantly on each of the four substantive dimensions. F-values $p < .01$ were obtained for female groups on all four positive-negative subscales. F-values $p < .01$ were obtained for males on Trustworthiness, Altruism, and Independence subscales, and $p < .05$ on the Strength of Will subscale. The means and F-values for both males and females are shown in Table 1.

F-values $p < .05$ were obtained for females on the last two dimensions of the PHN, but those scores did not follow the linear pattern of the substantive subscales. Differences among males on these two individual-differences dimensions were not significant. These dimensions, complexity and variability, deal with beliefs about the differences in human nature and may not be conceptualized on an evaluative dimension.

Mean scores on the Taylor MAS also showed significant differences among

classes, with the trend being toward increasingly higher scores in more recent classes. MAS scores can range from 0 to 50. The mean score of females in 1959 was 14.20, rising to 21.50 in 1968. For males the mean scores went from 14.22 in 1959 to 19.24 in 1968. The mean score for each year and the F-values are shown in Table 1. Each female sample had a higher mean than that of the class before; this was true of males also, except for the 1960 freshmen. High scores on the MAS are indicators of overt admissions of anxiety, indicating that more recent freshmen express more anxiety symptoms than did earlier classes.

On each of the PHN subscales and the MAS scales which showed a significant F-ratio a post-hoc test for trend by orthogonal polynomials was made (Winer, 1962). The results showed a significant linear component for both male and female groups on the PHN positive-negative dimensions, indicating that the mean scores could be plotted along a straight line. Also, the MAS scores for male and female groups showed a significant linear trend. For example, the linear F for females on Trustworthiness was 66.86, which is significant beyond .0001. The trend analysis for female groups showed linear F-values for all four PHN substantive subscales and for the MAS which were significant beyond .0001. The linear F-values for males were significant beyond .0001 on Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, and on MAS; and the linear F on Strength of Will showed $p < .01$. Table 2 indicates the values obtained in the trend analysis.[2]

To see if there were ability differences or demographic differences between classes which would explain the increasing cynicism and anxiety several further analyses were made.

---

[2] The author wishes to thank Cecil Clark for assistance with the computer application of the trend analysis.

One-way analyses of variance were made for ACT percentile scores. The ACT Composite scores did not show a significant difference for females. For males the F-value for mean differences in ACT Composite scores was 24.64, with $p < .01$. However, the highest mean score on ACT Composite for males was in 1966, and there was no consistent increase from year to year. ACT scores were not available for the years prior to 1963. Table 3 indicates the mean ACT percentile scores and F-values for English, mathematics, social science, natural science, and composite.

Ten items from the College Student Questionnaire, Part 1 (ETS, 1965) were selected for comparison of the classes of 1966, 1967, and 1968. (CSQ data was not available for all the classes included in the previous comparisons.) Chi square tests were made separately for males and females. The following items of information were compared among the three classes: age at time of testing; philosophy of higher education (i.e., vocational orientation, academic orientation, collegiate orientation, nonconformist orientation); parents' marital status; birth order; parents' child rearing policy; reaction to cheating; feelings about competing. The comparison of ages of the male groups yielded a chi square value which was significant ($p < .05$). None of the other items compared yielded a significant chi square value. Tables of the chi square comparisons are included in the Appendix of this paper.

Conclusions and Discussion

There were two major findings in this study of the recent freshman classes at Peabody College: (1) positive views of human nature decreased; (2) overt anxiety increased.

The scores on the four dimensions of the PHN which measure positive vs. negative views of other persons indicate a lessening of idealism, or an increase

in cynicism. Except for minor reversals in the 1967 freshman class, the means are successively lower each year on the measures which tap favorability of attitudes.

Of equal interest was the steady climb of mean scores on manifest anxiety. In the classes comprising the present investigation, reported anxiety increased each year.

Explanations for this pattern of findings could be of two types: (1) The freshman classes differ in other ways which relate to the PHN and MAS scores (i.e., each freshman class comes from a somewhat different population than the previous years), or, (2) Loss of trust and high anxiety are a part of the Zeitgeist.

The review of supplemental information for comparison of the classes did not reveal any pattern of variability which would account for the class differences in PHN and MAS scores. Although some of the ACT scores differed significantly among classes the lack of a consistent yearly increase leaves doubt as to their relationship to the PHN and MAS differences. Also, a study (Nottingham, 1968) correlating information on the CSQ with PHN scores within the 1967 freshman class indicated that PHN substantive subscale scores were unrelated to CSQ responses.

The findings of this investigation point to the need for discovering elements within society which have contributed to this loss of faith in human nature and an accompanying rise in anxiety.

In a discussion of identity and uprootedness Erikson wrote:

". . . man is apt to feel uprooted with himself on every step of his development as a distinctive person. It begins early, for hardly has he learned to recognize the familiar face (the original harbor of basic trust) when he becomes also frightfully aware of the unfamiliar, the strange face, the

unresponsive, the averted, the darkened, and the frowning face. And here begins . . . that inexplicable tendency on man's part to feel that he has caused the face to turn away which happened to turn elsewhere." (Erikson, 1964, p. 102)

Numerous explanations may help to explain the loss of trust and the rise in anxiety. These explanations may be categorized as sympathetic, as critical, or as neutral (Halleck, 1968).

Explanations sympathetic to the student view him as the victim of man-made circumstances and his unrest as a legitimate and rational effort to change these circumstances. The more obvious social conditions fitting this category are the Vietnam war, the pressures on the student to compete, the anonymity associated with technology and bigness, and the identification of the student with the Negro and the poor.

As an attempt to find explanations from college students themselves, the investigator met with a group of George Peabody College students who had been included in the classes analyzed in this study. The group comprised a section of an educational psychology class selected for participation in a tutoring project with Head Start children. A brief report of the findings regarding increasing negativism and increasing anxiety was presented, and the students were asked to react to the findings. Their responses were tape-recorded. No one in the group expressed surprise at the direction of the findings. When asked why college freshmen would have reported less positive views of the nature of man and increases in anxiety the most frequently-named answers were: Vietnam, pressures to make high grades to get into college, racial rioting, and assassinations of public figures. The following were typical comments:

"Oh, I think it's Vietnam. The guys feel pressure to make the grades so they won't be drafted. The girls feel anxious about Vietnam, because there goes

the husband pool."

"When you see riots in the streets on your TV every day, why wouldn't you be anxious?"

"About those Independence scores . . . a person feels very little control over his environment . . . it all ties into the war."

"Young people don't trust the government. There's been a tendency for young people not to feel involved in government, but that's changing now. The little man can't be heard in government, and young people are identifying with these 'out' groups."

"Every year it gets harder to get into college. The competition gets worse."

"When we were in junior high they started this big thing on critical thinking. We were taught to question everything. Before, we thought everything was o.k., then when we learned to question we became more distressed."

"Being in this section of educational psychology makes me anxious! Tutoring those kids and seeing how bad things really are makes me depressed."

The last of the above quotations suggests that the greater exposure to the effects of impoverished environments may contribute to anxiety and loss of trust in the basic goodness of man. With emphasis on Peace Corps, Vista, and community involvement of students the current generation of students has a more realistic view of the effects of poverty and of inequalities of opportunity.

The feeling of increasing competition for grades to get into college as an obstacle to youthful idealism has been articulated by Greeley (1968). The psychosocial moratorium of late adolescence is truncated for most young Americans because if one is to be a success, one must choose the right college, take the right courses, pass the right exams. Changes, hesitations, or delays may be hindrances to one's career. This kind of pressure does not allow time for the process of identity formation.

Flacks (1967) referred to the high degree of impersonality and competitiveness in high schools and universities. He hypothesized that the student unrest grew out of the incompatibility between an emerging pattern of familial relations and institutional expectations. In many upper middle class, professional homes there has been emphasis on democratic, egalitarian relations and a high degree of permissiveness with emphasis on values other than achievement. Young people reared in this kind of family setting find it difficult to submit to adult authority and to a high degree of competition. They are intolerant of what they perceive as hypocrisy on the part of adults who express values different from the style of life actually practiced.

One of the student's explanations regarding the emphasis on critical thinking suggests the hypothesis that students each year are simply more accustomed to looking for faults in others. It is possible that responding negatively to items such as those of the PHN has acquired social desirability value. Edwards (1957) has shown that subjects generally attribute desirable characteristics to themselves. If the schools have emphasized the need for critical thinking a negative stance may have come to be viewed as socially desirable.

Some hypotheses of student discontent are not so sympathetic to the students. The affluence hypothesis says that the child reared in an affluent society does not learn to use work as a means of mastering some aspect of the world and is thus trapped in a never-ending search for new diversions and new freedoms (Halleck, 1968).

The permissiveness hypothesis lays blame upon parents who have abdicated their responsibility to discipline their children, thus rearing a generation of spoiled, greedy youth. Even rational forms of discipline, such as the need to master basic concepts before moving on to more abstract ideas, bother them (Halleck, 1968).

In addition to explanations sympathetic to or critical of students, there are further hypotheses which may be seen as neutral, in that they refer to more subtle societal changes which affect the values of youth.

Keniston (1968) suggested that the accelerating rate of innovation means that the wisdom and skills of fathers can no longer be transmitted to sons with any assurance that they will be appropriate for them. This means that truth must as often be created by children as learned from parents.

Another social force to be considered is the pervasive influence of television. Although the psychological impact of television has not been adequately determined there is reason to believe that today's youth have been continually exposed to the cynical facts of life more rapidly and at an earlier age than they could be assimilated. The effect of this premature emergence of truth may have helped create a deep skepticism as to the validity of authority (Halleck, 1968). The role of media prevents any easy inference that the explanation for increasing cynicism is a deterioration in the quality of life in the society. It may not be so much that life is getting worse as that the continuous exposure to behavior of man which is less than trustworthy and other than altruistic may subtly affect one's basic philosophy of human nature. Television has also made possible an instant awareness of the gaps between the ideals professed by American society and the practices which contradict that profession.

All the above explanations may combine to describe the Zeitgeist which has frustrated youthful idealism.

This frustration of youthful idealism may be seen as a social waste. More information is needed as to the causes of what appears to be a creeping cynicism. In line with this need, at his last news conference as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen releasted Toward A Social Report. This is a study representing the federal government's first attempt to measure

and evaluate systematically the social well-being of the nation. As an effort to assess the social state of the nation, the report is regarded as preliminary. It is intended, however, to be a set of social indicators which can improve public policy-making. A social indicator (Bauer, 1966) may be defined as a statistic of direct normative interest which facilitates concise, comprehensive and balanced judgments about the condition of major aspects of a society. It is a direct measure of welfare and is subject to the interpretation that, if it changes in the "right" direction, while other things remain equal, people are "better off." Toward A Social Report encourages the collection of new and more socially relevant data as measures of the condition of American society.

If the findings of this investigation are viewed as a social indicator then attention must be given to what may be second-order effects of an increasingly negative view of human nature and an increase in anxiety.

It is not assumed that young people are deliberately cynical. Given something like the Peace Corps which promises challenge and a genuine expression of idealism, an extraordinary number of young people respond. When society as a whole offers them challenging opportunities they may not need to mistrust others as a way of avoiding damaging commitment to false life styles or goals.

"To live as a philosophical 'stranger' is one of the choices of mature man; to have that choice the immature person must, with our help, first find a home in the actuality of work and love." (Erikson, 1964, p. 99)

References

American College Testing Program. General information bulletin. Iowa City, Ia.: ACT Program, 1965.

Bauer, R. A. (Ed.) Social indicators. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Brookover, W. B., Gottlieb, D., Lehmann, I. J., Richards, R., Thaden, J. F., & Vener, A. M. The college student. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Brown, D. R. Student stress and the institutional environment. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 92-107.

Cowan, J. L. Freedom, protest, and university environments. Paper prepared for symposium at American Psychological Association convention. New York City, September, 1966.

Crane, R. M. Unrest on campus--revolution or evolution? College and University, 1967, 42, 209-217.

Educational Testing Service. Supervisor's manual for the College Student Questionnaires. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

Edwards, A. L. The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Dryden Press, 1957.

Erikson, E. H. Insight and responsibility. New York: Norton, 1964.

Feuer, L. S. The conflict of generations: the character and significance of student movements. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Fishbein, M. (Ed.) Readings in attitude theory and measurement. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Flacks, R. The liberated generation: an explanation of the roots of student protest. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 52-75.

Goldsen, R., Rosenberg, M., Williams, R., & Suchman, E. What college students think. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1960.

Goodman, M. Campus youth in an age of anomie. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, 1967, 29, 188-192.

Greeley, A. The college blight on idealism. Educational Record, 1968, 49, 429-434.

Haan, N., Smith, M. B., & Block, J. Moral reasoning of young adults: political-social behavior, family background, and personality correlates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 183-201.

Halleck, S. L. Hypotheses of student unrest. Education Digest, November, 1968, 13-17.

Hartnett, R., & Peterson, R. Religious preference as a factor in attitudinal and background differences among college freshmen. Sociology of Education, 1968, 41, 227-237.

Jacob, P. Changing values in college. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Jones, L. The new world view of Negro youth. In M. Sherif, and C. Sherif (Eds.), Problems of youth: transition to adulthood in a changing world. Chicago: Aldine, 1965. Pp. 65-88.

Keniston, K. Social change and youth in America. Daedalus, 1962, 91, 145-171.

Keniston, K. The sources of student dissent. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 108-137.

Komorita, S. Attitude content, intensity, and the neutral point on a Likert scale. Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 327-334.

Mallery, D. Ferment on the campus: an encounter with the new college generation. New York: Harper, 1966.

Mogar, R. Value orientations of college students: preliminary data and review of the literature. Psychological Reports, Monograph Supplement 5-V15, 1964.

Nottingham, J. The relationship between family background and philosophy of human nature. Paper presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association convention, Roanoke, Va., April, 1968.

Nottingham, J., Gorsuch, R., & Wrightsman, L. S., Jr. A factor analysis of items from the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale. Paper presented at Southeastern Psychological Association convention, Roanoke, Va., April, 1968.

Peterson, R. Organized student protest in 1964-65. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, 1967, 30, 50-56.

Sampson, E. Student activism and the decade of protest. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 1-33.

Sanford, N. Developmental status of the entering freshman. In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American college. New York: Wiley, 1962. Pp. 253-282.

Sanford, N. The college student in the world today. In K. Yamamoto (Ed.), The college student and his culture: an analysis. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968. Pp. 131-143.

Shaffer, R. Peace Corps: antidote for provincialism. School and Society, 1967, 95, 252-268.

Taylor, J. A personality scale of manifest anxiety. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 285-290.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Toward a social report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Watts, W., Lynch, S., & Whittaker, D. Alienation and activism in today's college-age youth: socialization patterns and current family relationships. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 1-7.

Weitzner, M., Statlove, F., & Smith, G. Personality profiles of high, middle, and low MAS subjects. Journal of Psychology, 1967, 65, 163-168.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Wrightsman, L. S., Jr. Philosophies of human nature and styles of interpersonal behavior. A review of the literature and proposal for research. Paper prepared for Division 8 Discussion Group, American Psychological Association convention, New York, August, 1961.

Wrightsman, L. S., Jr. Measurement of philosophies of human nature. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 743-751.

Wrightsman, L. S., Jr. Annotated bibliography of research on the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale--1968 revision. Unpublished paper, George Peabody College, 1968. (Mimeo, 35 pp.)

Wrightsman, L. S., Jr., & Satterfield, C. Additional norms and standardization of the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale--1967 revision. A revision of the PHN norms. Unpublished paper, George Peabody College, 1967. (Mimeo, 15 pp.)

Zdep, S. Intelligence, creativity, and anxiety among college students. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 420.

Table 1

Mean PHN and Taylor MAS Scores for Peabody Freshman Classes

1959 - 1968***

	Year	N	PHN Trust.	PHN St.W.	PHN Alt.	PHN Ind.	PHN Comol.	PHN Varib.	MAS
FEMALES	1959	176	***	***	***	***	***	***	14.20
	1960	175	***	***	***	***	***	***	14.33
	1962	250	+9.80	+15.30	+5.10	+4.30	+8.80	+16.20	****
	1965	261	+6.93	+12.52	-0.46	+2.36	+6.88	+17.47	17.01
	1966	189	+3.57	+12.27	-3.16	-0.26	+6.48	+16.46	18.76
	1967	170	+4.38	+10.11	-1.54	-0.11	+8.81	+17.88	19.80
	1968	165	+0.41	+ 9.08	-3.91	-1.17	+9.17	+16.99	21.50
	F		29.83**	54.45**	15.93**	8.11**	2.43*	2.95*	38.67**
MALES	1959	58	***	***	***	***	***	***	14.22
	1960	60	***	***	***	***	***	***	13.88
	1962	63	+8.38	+13.21	+1.54	+2.95	+7.06	+15.87	****
	1965	84	+3.98	+ 9.86	-4.80	+0.17	+4.90	+14.36	16.68
	1966	56	-0.43	+8.55	-7.95	-2.05	+5.59	+15.41	19.07
	1967	54	+0.50	+9.22	-3.37	-2.00	+6.39	+16.31	19.04
	1968	50	-5.38	+8.30	-11.58	-4.66	+5.48	+16.02	19.24
	F		9.40**	2.37*	8.63**	3.39**	0.37	0.45	9.42**

Possible range of scores on PHN: -42 to +42
Possible range of scores on MAS: 0 to 50

* F of 2.37 for $p < .05$
** F of 3.32 for $p < .01$
*** PHN was not administered in 1959, 1960, 1961, 1963, 1964
**** MAS was not administered in 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964

Table 2

Test for Trend by Orthogonal Polynomials

Linear Trend Analysis

Scale	Females F linear	Females p	Males F linear	Males p
PHN - Trustworthiness	66.862	0.0000	34.099	0.0000
PHN - Strength of Will	54.425	0.0000	6.227	0.0126
PHN - Altruism	40.474	0.0000	21.919	0.0000
PHN - Independence	25.696	0.0000	12.394	0.0008
PHN - Complexity	1.065	0.3026	***	***
PHN - Variability	0.349	0.5617	***	***
MAS	139.096	0.0000	21.550	0.0000

*** For males, PHN - Complexity and PHN - Variability were not included in the trend analysis because the analysis of variance F-values were not significant.

Table 3

Mean ACT Percentile Scores for Peabody Freshman Classes

	Females						Males					
Year	N	Eng.	Math.	Soc.Sci.	Nat.Sci.	Comp.	N	Eng.	Math.	Soc.Sci.	Nat.Sci.	Comp.
1963	201	61.05	45.83	54.27	46.58	51.37	58	46.40	45.83	54.91	54.55	52.28
1965	311	60.68	48.13	60.74	51.06	55.59	110	49.55	57.78	59.27	59.46	58.15
1966	180	66.68	50.76	61.37	53.96	58.92	49	53.04	55.84	66.41	65.23	60.96
1967	128	66.14	51.22	54.73	52.83	56.65	54	50.53	49.74	56.53	57.12	54.16
1968	113	65.27	57.31	55.23	51.14	57.36	30	60.67	52.87	59.10	61.30	59.30
F		2.72*	3.82**	3.42**	2.09	2.25		3.51**	4.47**	7.33**	3.20*	24.64**

* F ($p < .05 = 2.37$)
** F ($p < .01 = 3.32$)

APPENDIX

Chi Square Comparisons

of CSQ Data

(Educational Testing Service, 1965)

CSQ Item 2 - Age

	Females			Males		
Age	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968
16	2	2	1	1	0	0
17	46	49	30	8	11	11
18	128	116	116	32	32	23
19	8	4	12	6	3	7
20	3	2	3	0	0	3
21	0	0	1	4	0	0
22	1	0	0	2	0	0
23	1	1	1	0	1	0
24-	2	4	7	4	1	1
N=	191	178	171	N= 57	48	45
		χ^2 = 16.54			χ^2 = 27.21*	

*Table value of χ^2 with 16 d.f.=26.30, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 49

Educational Philosophy A

(Vocational Orientation)

Choice	Females			Males		
	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968
1 most accurate	47	38	34	21	15	12
2 2nd most accurate	81	69	76	19	18	16
3 3rd most accurate	55	60	42	14	11	15
4 least accurate	12	10	19	3	4	2
N=	191	178	171	47	48	45
	χ^2 = 8.28			χ^2 = 2.72		

Table value of χ^2 with 6 d.f.=12.59, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 50

Educational Philosophy B

(Academic Orientation)

Choice	Females			Males		
	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968
1 most accurate	45	29	25	9	7	9
2 2nd most accurate	68	62	56	23	22	14
3 3rd most accurate	71	71	77	22	14	16
4 least accurate	10	16	12	5	5	6
N=	194	178	170	59	48	45
	χ^2 = 7.94			χ^2 = 2.91		

Table value of χ^2 with 6 d.f.=12.59, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 51

Educational Philosophy C

(Collegiate Orientation)

Choice	Females 1966	Females 1967	Females 1968	Males 1966	Males 1967	Males 1968
1 most accurate	95	100	10⁄	18	16	19
2 2nd most accurate	31	33	23	10	7	13
3 3rd most accurate	47	28	32	14	20	8
4 least accurate	21	15	10	10	5	6
N=	194	176	169	52	48	46
	χ^2 = 9.94			χ^2 = 9.02		

Table value of χ^2 with 6 d.f.=12.59, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 52

Educational Philosophy D

(Nonconformist Orientation)

Choice	Females 1966	Females 1967	Females 1968	Males 1966	Males 1967	Males 1968
1 most accurate	9	7	5	8	8	5
2 2nd most accurate	11	15	18	7	4	4
3 3rd most accurate	21	17	18	7	3	5
4 least accurate	152	140	129	38	33	31
N=	193	179	170	60	48	45
	χ^2 = 3.67			χ^2 = 1.96		

Table value of χ^2 with 6 d.f.=12.59, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 103

Parents' Marital Status

Choice	Females 1966	Females 1967	Females 1968	Males 1966	Males 1967	Males 1968
1 living together	160	153	140	42	39	33
2 divorced, separated	10	C	15	5	3	7
3 father deceased	17	8	13	9	5	3
4 mother deceased	0	3	2	1	0	0
5 both parents deceased	0	1	2	1	1	1
N=	187	171	172	58	48	44
	χ^2 = 12.43			χ^2 = 5.95		

Table value of χ^2 with 8 d.f.=15.51, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 106 - Birth Order

Choice	Females 1966	Females 1967	Females 1968	Males 1966	Males 1967	Males 1968
1 only child	16	22	16	6	6	4
2 oldest child	80	63	64	20	23	16
3 youngest child	42	40	40	14	11	8
4 in-between child	47	41	49	17	7	15
N=	185	166	169	57	47	43
	χ^2 = 3.60			χ^2 = 5.80		

Table value of χ^2 with 6 d.f.=12.59, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 128

Parents' Child-Rearing Policy

Choice	Females 1966	Females 1967	Females 1968	Males 1966	Males 1967	Males 1968
1 authoritarian	28	29	28	13	13	10
2 permissive	11	6	6	6	7	2
3 mutuality	148	139	133	43	27	31
N=	187	174	167	62	47	43
		χ^2 = 1.79			χ^2 = 3.75	

Table value of χ^2 with 4 d.f.=9.49, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 139

Reaction to Cheating

Choice	Females 1966	Females 1967	Females 1968	Males 1966	Males 1967	Males 1968
1 not disturbed	10	18	16	7	7	6
2 disturbed	88	73	86	18	19	16
3 action depends . . .	20	21	21	5	6	7
4 talk to cheater	45	40	30	21	11	13
5 report without naming	22	17	11	4	3	1
6 report student	4	5	6	2	2	0
N=	189	174	170	57	48	43
		χ^2 = 9.92			χ^2 = 6.19	

Table value of χ^2 with 10 d.f.=18.3, $p < .05$

CSQ Item 145

Feelings about Competing

	Females			Males		
Choice	1966	1967	1968	1966	1967	1968
1 dislike	50	47	67	12	10	11
2 neutral	72	71	54	22	18	14
3 enjoy	62	57	54	23	21	20
N=	184	175	175	N= 57	49	45
		$\chi^2 = 7.71$			$\chi^2 = 4.25$	

Table value of χ^2 with 4 d.f.=9.5, $p < .05$